NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY - AUGUST 1960

? ? ? FOR KENNEDY

By Louise Harding

THE PARTY SYSTEM NOT WORKING WELL

By James L. Brewer

THE HUMANISM OF KRUSHCHEV

By Kenneth Leslie

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS

DO NOT ARM WEST GERMANY

By Stephen Fritchman

Vol. XIII, No. 4 30 Cents

? ? ? FOR KENNEDY

By Louise Harding

Excerpts from "*Catholic Victory in* 1960?"—by Peter J. Doeswyck, D.D., P. O. Box 1651, Long Beach, California, Paperback, $1.50. (giving orig. Latin and translation, in parallel columns).

Christian Constitution

IMMORTALE DEI, ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII, Nov. 1, 1885. (Calling the demands of the masses for equality (egalite) and for freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, etc., a movement "OF UNBRIDLED LIBERTY" (effrenatae libertatis), Pope Leo (d. 1903) explains and condemns democracy as follows):

Of their (democratic) principles this one is the most important: that ALL MEN ARE UNDERSTOOD TO BE EQUAL by birth and by nature, so that in reality they are equals throughout the course of their lives . . . that he should be FREE to think what he likes in every matter . . .

In a society guided under such rule, there is no other legal authority than the consent of the people, who, as the power is vested exclusively in them, so they alone govern themselves . . . thus they transfer not so much the *right* as the *function* of the government to themselves, and that to be exercised in their name.

Divine rule is passed over in silence . . . as if there could be any government whose whole cause, power and authority was not vested in God himself. In this manner, as we see, the State is nothing else than a MOB as its own master and governor.

Such doctrines . . . the Roman Pontiffs . . . by no means suffered to go without condemnation:

Thus Gregory XVI in his Encyclical Letter 'Mirari vos' of Aug. 15, 1832, denounced in very grave terms these doctrines . . . namely, that in matters of divine worship no preference should be shown; that it is right for individuals to judge matters of religion as they see fit; that the conscience of each man shall be his sole guide . . .

The same Pontiff spoke about the motives for separating Church and State as follows: 'Neither can we expect more favorable results either for religion or for the government from the wishes of those who plan to separate the Church from the State . . . It is evident that such a concord is naturally feared by the lovers of the most shameless liberty . . .

From these verdicts of the Popes it must be absolutely understood that the origin of public power is to be sought from God himself and not from the mob.'

. . . that it is a crime for private individuals and a crime for States . . . to treat different kinds of religons in one and the same way; that the unabridged power of thinking and of publicly sounding off one's opinion is not among the r i g h t s of the

citizens . . .

The Catholic Church, then, teaches concerning the constitution and government of States as follows:

. . . None of the various forms of governments is *per se* condemned so long as they have *nothing* which is repugnant to Catholic doctrine . . .

. . . Wherefore it is clear that there is a just reason for Catholics to seek public office; for they do not nor must they seek office for the reason that they may approve that which is morally wrong in the present form of government, but in order that they may change the very form, as far as possible, for the common good, pure and true; keeping in mind this goal: to infuse into all the veins of government the most healthy sap and blood, that is, the wisdom and virtue of the Catholic religion.

The means of obtaining these ends cannot easily be regulated by one and the same method, because they must fit particular places and circumstances, which differ considerably from each other. Nevertheless, let unity of planning be maintained and let uniformity of action be sought above all things. And both will be best attained if all regard the orders of the Apostolic See as the rule of life and take orders from the Bishops . . .

Given at Rome on the first day of November, in the year 1885.

Pope Leo XIII.

Oath of the President of the United States

Presidents, Supreme Court judges, and other officials must take an oath that they will uphold the Constitution and the laws of this land. The oath of the President reads:

"I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully . . . preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

No Roman Catholic is required to publicly renounce his faith in his religious leader in Italy. Neither is a Roman Catholic compelled to seek the presidential office of a Protestant or non-Catholic country. However, when a Roman Catholic seeks the presidency of a non-Catholic country with the intention of breaking his presidential oath and of committing perjury and treason, this man is not qualified for this highest office of the land. These facts are self-evident, and those who present these facts are not bigots but true patriots.

Proposed Oath of the Presidential Candidate

No Roman Catholic devotee, Roman Catholic Sympathizer, or non-Catholic secretly committed to Rome, is fit and worthy of the American presidency unless he can conscientiously subscribe to the following declaration:

Whereas the "Christian Constitution" of the Roman Catholic Church *(Bull "Immortale Dei")* condemns the most fundamental laws of the American Constitution, and declares heretical those democratic principles which are most highly revered by the American people; and

Whereas the same Roman Constitution holds it unlawful for a candidate of the Roman Catholic faith to protect and defend in public life laws and principles which are contrary to papal laws and principles;

I hereby solemnly swear, without any mental reservation, that I denounce as heretical and subversive all papal doctrines, precepts and directives which are repugnant to the laws and democratic principles of our American Constitution and our American institutions.

Creed of Any Presidential Candidate

As every loyal American citizen subscribes to the following American principles, assuredly a worthy candidate for the American presidency could have no objection to subscribing to the following declarations:

1. I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and I do solemnly swear that I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which opposes this American principle and which seeks to corrupt the minds of our citizens by defining democracy as the rule by the mob.

2. I believe that the just power of the American government is derived from the consent of the governed, i.e., the American people, and that its authority is not vested in, nor subordinate to, nor dependent upon the consent and divine jurisdiction assumed by any religious leader, foreign or domestic.

3. I believe this truth to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and I reject as heretical and subversive the theory that certain privileged men and classes are predestined by birth, by religion or by ordination to rule dictatorially over the secular and civil affairs of their fellow citizens.

4. I believe that liberty is one of the certain inalienable rights of men, and I reject as untrue the medieval concept that man by nature is subject to masters and rulers in whose election or elevation he had no voice, direct or indirect. I do solemnly swear I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which denies that this nation was conceived in liberty.

5. I believe in freedom of religion; and I disown allegiance to any leader or organization which holds that man is not free to follow his own conscience and to worship God as he sees fit.

6. I believe in the unabridged freedom of speech and of the press; and I disown allegiance to any person or group which ridicules this American principle by calling it "unbridled liberty," and which denies that this particular freedom is among the rights of citizens.

7. I believe in separation of Church and State, and I disown allegiance to any religious leader who dares to anathematize and excommunicate his subjects for adherence to this American prin-

ciple.

8. I believe that churches and people of all faiths have equal rights and that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and I do solemnly swear that I owe no allegiance to any person or organization which rejects the Bill of Rights and which holds that the Roman Catholic faith must be made the state religion of all nations, that it must receive preference over all other religions even when in the minority, and that it is a crime for private citizens and for States to treat non-Catholic religions on an equal basis.

9. I believe that the Protestant, Greek, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Jewish and other faiths are to be treated equal according to the Constitution of my country; and I promise that, if elected, I will refuse to give diplomatic and political preference to any particular religious ruler by appointing an American ambassador to him, or by making any secret commitments to him or to his American representatives.

10. I believe that the American laws, constitutions and the authority vested by the people in the President are supreme, and not subordinate to foreign laws or a foreign constitution; and I solemnly swear that I do not owe allegiance to any foreign ruler or organization which holds that our Constitution is unconstitutional and not binding in conscience wherever it is contrary to ecclesiastical laws and pontifical decrees.

11. I believe that the marriages of American citizens performed by the Justice of the Peace or before an authorized minister are valid; regardless of the faith wherein the parties happened to be baptized; and I disown allegiance to any person or organization which holds that the State may not and cannot join in matrimony certain citizens of certain fatihs, and which holds that civil marriages of certain parties are invalid and that the offspring thereof is illegitimate.

12. I believe that one is not faithful to his oath of office in case one seeks the office of the President for the purpose of destroying the democratic principles laid down by our Constitution; and I do solemnly swear that I do not owe allegiance to any person or organization which demands its members to infiltrate the branches of government for the direct purpose of overthrowing our democratic form of government and supplanting it by foreign, religious, or fascist rule.

(The foregoing comprise about 15 pgs. of the 110 comprising this valuable work—L.H.)

THE PARTY SYSTEM NOT WORKING WELL

By JAMES L. BREWER

From the NATION, Feb. 6, 1960

"Beneath a surface of massive triviality momentous issues long in the making may yet give shape and content to the 1960 election. The Nation has insisted that a politics of peace must emerge as cold war tensions abated. This is now happening because peace has become the dominant concern of every thoughtful American. Yet it remains the great undebated issue; the candidates resolutely refuse to discuss it unless it is safely encased in quotation marks. The one hope, therefore, of keeping this election from being as carefully rigged as a TV quiz show is to force a discussion of the one issue that matters. Implicit in a politics of peace is the clearer need to evolve a set of institutions adequate to cope with the World Community."

The Nation in solemn warning proceeds:

"At intervals history has a way of inundating politicians, of sweeping them down and under, of making matchwood of their stale rights and formulas. The big floods in politics—when torrents of new forces and ideas sweep aside the old entrenched positions—usually come when the people have moved far in advance of the politicians, when 'new politics' are pushing to the surface, when the parties have become virtually indistinguishable on basic issues."

From the dean of columnists

Walter Lippman has expressed amazement at a morbidity of content and tone of the 1960 presidential contest, "a strange, disconcerting, listless political drive. Some would say it is because the people are lulled by their material comforts and are drugged by the official assurances, that all is well and nothing will happen to them." The writer continued, "This begs the question which is why in these momentous times our people have been lulled and drugged into apathy and complacency. I venture to think that the answer to the question is that the party system is not working as it is meant to work. It is throttling debate and stifling ideas."

The Nation has provided two masterly articles, complementary of each other, for the voters' guidance, dealing with fundamental, spiritual and cultural values bearing on politics in paramount challenge as vital issues of an historic 1960 election.

James Reichley, novelist and political writer, author of "The Art of Government" a Fund of the Republic study, has written for the Nation of February 6th, an article entitled, "1960: Failure of Social Imagination," and Glen Tinder, of the Government Department of the University of Massachusetts, in Feb. 20 Nation, one entitled, "1960: Failure of Political Imagination."

Professor Reichley sees the presidential candidates as actually

jostling for the honor of being best fitted to maintain the security of the existing Establishment. Even scholarly Adlai Stevenson reacts to the situation haltingly with but cultivated criticism, rather than with fundamental dissent. The prospect seems a perversive politicians' election by way of the sheer party rivalry mechanics bereft of profound statesmanship need. Lack of dissonance is sacrificed to politicians' singular reluctance to disagree with opposition success apparently for the time unrivaled. And the cold war stalemate itself, giving 'Don't-Rock-the-Boat' respectability of a slogan in the measure that the boat actually appears to be in some danger of sinking, made dissent no longer to be safely enjoyed. This, Reichley holds, explains the growing tendency today among leading politicians in both parties toward unity in opinion.

It seems to point to the drying up of social imagination. American academies generally report there never has been much genuine clash among idealogies in the United States.

Behind the explanations for lack of current dissent, Reichley adds, an odd series of accommodations have worked out in American politics during the past thirty years between Democrat, Progressive and Conservative. The democratic politicians and progressive technicians have worked out a quantitative prosperity of welfare to carry the democrats to a vote superiority over the conservatives, but the latter have managed to recover substantial ground by devising alliances with susceptible democrats, giving the democrats practical control over the legislative branch of the Federal government. The combination of votes supplied by the democrats and the brains supplied by the progressive technicians and publicists was able for the first time in many years to overthrow the dominance of the business community of the United States.

From about 1938 onward, Reichley continues, an alliance between conservatives and democrats held practical control over the legislative branch of the Federal government, absolute command of most of the state and municipal governments with growing influence in the Federal executive. Democrats continued to extend their political dominance, and conservatives have settled more securely into their privileged positions in the social and economic hierarchies. The latter have captured democratic leadership with political patronage, abdicating responsibility, while democrats in turn have consented to the status quo. It has been pointed out, he says, that in England since World War II conservatives have paid the price of the welfare state for their continuance of the political system, while in the United States conservatives have preserved the economic system at the expense of allowing political control to fall into the hands of the democrats.

Reichley credits but a trickle of benefit to the progressive

cause under the presumed democratic alliance during the past twenty years. The progressive American cause finding indifferent promise of continued viability in factional elements of both old parties, notably Humphrey-Clark reformists' vigor of today, and the reminiscence of the Senator Taft stir among the Republicans without stamp of a genuine revival of effective leadership, the Borah, LaFollett, Johnson, Pinchot type of liberal not figuring in the GOP today. Few progressives seem willing to work with the conservatives in the GOP, says Reichley. They are still inclined to believe that only the democrats can restore the Nation to the path of social progress, but having yielded the power of veto to the business community the latter are submitting to conservative dictation as well as the democratic tastes and prejudices. The progressives are getting very little in return. The progressives' imagination, as a result, is subjected to bewildering frustration.

Reichley concludes: "The product of all this has been a new Era of Good Feeling among politicians, expansively liberal in rhetoric and unflinchingly conservative in practice. The candidates for the Presidency have come to sound so much alike that the electorate seems called upon to choose among them in much the same way that the owners select a new chairman of the Board on the basis of character, experience and ability. It is only hypocrisy to suggest that a choice be made on the basis of 'issues'.

"This unanimity is not likely to endure for long. Progressives will not suffer forever beneath the yoke of democratic politicians. This does not mean that progressives will, or should become undemocratic. It does mean that within the foreseeable future, brains will begin to protest their role as tail to the kite of the party of numbers, which long since has attached itself to the guiding hand of special privilege."

Deathly Irrelevance:

Educator Tinder's diagnosis of the 1960 Presidential campaign outlook is an ominous picture of groping uncertainty of those seeking power and of voters, indicative that the issues are more contrived and the lethargy of the onlookers more profound than is usual, expressing failure of political imagination. More than of the problems of the great power politics there is international concern that our cities are uncontrollably sweeping the people into vast unstructured agglomerations little suited for truly human life.

The writer points to statistics of juvenile delinquincy for indications of something wrong in society as a whole, unsatisfactory attainment and effort in the field of education. Television quiz scandals reflecting on the state both of our morality and culture. No party program and no presidential candidate, he declares, leads to a comprehensive vision of our situation. If it is true that

we are entering a new political age, there is no single political program to guide the electorate. As long as the competing national leaders do not meet this need, the writer maintains, our politics is threatened with a deadly irrelevance. He poses as a test of the validity of this sense of irrelevance a comparison of the insights of what may be referred to as the "political mind" with those of the "literary mind," the latter, whose prime function is that of discernment and communication, rather than the gaining of particular goals.

The comparison in the scholar's diagnosis reveals an ominous chasm between the two. He stresses the central tenet of the Western society, as well as in America, as welfare of the people as a whole, the paramount task of every political leader to convince the electorate that his party is the most effective instrument for the attainment of protecting and improving the average man's standard of life. And it appears that the conservative parties are little more inclined to ignore the standard than are their more egalitarian and reformist opponents.

The class society concept is giving way to something essentially different—mass society. The central fact has become the dominance of multitudes who among themselves are more or less equal and in respect to economic circumstances are more or less contented. Inequalities remain; but the chief characteristics of contemporary society are no longer set so much by the ruling temper of the upper classes as by the ruling temper of the masses. This upsetting hypothesis is supported by the reminder that the most exhilarating heights of prosperity have in the past led abruptly to economic calamity.

The evidence that class society is passing is very compelling in the fact of incredibly vast production by the western nations in the world. It is unrealistic to suppose that the problem of economic cycles will remain unsolved.

Tinder expresses adequate scholarly restraint of prophecy, and says mass society is a long way from Utopia, but maintains that barring a third world war the great plunge that has recently been taken en masse by the people of Germany, of France, of England and of America heralds a new political age.

What has gone wrong, then, he asks, bearing on the present failure of political imagination? This is, he answers rhetorically, that mass society is accompanied by a state of disintegration far more subtle, but no less painful, and no less humanly destructive, than that which was in conflict between classes to be called "mass disintegration."

Tinder goes into deepened revelations of advanced psychology and philosophy to identify its manifestation as the isolation of the person; a mobility which often suddenly severs established relationships, the customary priority of organizational and commer-

cial considerations over those which are merely human, and a rate of historical change which frequently renders members of different generations incomprehensible to one another.

But mass disintegration does not affect relations among persons alone. Tinder further finely analyzes; "It also attenuates the bonds between man and place, man and nature, man and his possessions. Thus the ruthlessness of the contemporary individual is well known; the difficulty and infrequency of satisfactory contact with the natural world becomes plain if one reflects upon the extent to which modern life is carried on both indoors and within cities; and as for the relations of a person to his possessions the apparently radical idea of collective ownership is merely in line with a process of capitalistic collectivisation, which through such means as joint stock company, planned obsolescence and installment buying has for many decades been alienating man from his possessions." The estrangement of classes from one another, and the burdens of poverty are disappearing; but new estrangement is felt, and its anxieties are not less real than those of an earlier age, the writer emphasizes. "In all the leading nations of the West dominant literary voices utter man's estrangement, his philosophy known as Existentialism; the individualist's emotion of terror in discovering his absolute loneliness in the universe. An American literary school coincides.

More important, in the context of his treatise, Tinder sums up "If we recognize that our age is witness to the advent of mass society, in company with its own distinctive forms of estrangement, the present failure of political imagination seems to be explained.

"The failure lies essentially in the fact that the political mind is committed to an obsolete image of social disintegration and has so far been incapable of understanding a less palpable, but at present far more dangerous type of fragmentation. It appears to be not only literati who sense the declining urgency of the old issues. In Germany, in France, in England and to a degree in America, those parties (except for the Communists) which have in the past most strongly emphasized the evils of class disintegration and the values of equality are without power and in a state of crisis, while parties more or less explicitly conservative have a tenure of office made disturbingly impregnable by the support of economically contented masses."

Regarding the contention that pertains to inner crisis of the soul rather than to political challenge Tinder cites many conditions in America such as inadequacies in the schools, formlessness in the cities, irresponsibility of the mass communications industries definitely appearing both to have some relation to mass disintegration and to be within the scope of political concern. For conclusion Tinder says: "Political candidates and party managers cannot, of course, be expected to formulate profound new social

theories, but may be asked to demonstrate more convincingly than through euphemistic affirmations that we are 'on the threshold of a new age' their cognizance of the fact that the problems of this generation are not those of the last, nor, except in a very broad sense, those of any generation in history."

THE HUMANISM OF KRUSHCHEV

By Kenneth Leslie

A Soviet doctor, Pavel Beilin, in his book "Curing Body and Mind with Sleep" has this to say about humanism and I think it is exceedingly important:

"Humanism cannot be learned like a trade. It is neither a special profession nor a skilled trade. Our humanism is a requirement of the spirit, the air we breathe. It is our outlook on life, it is our philosophy. Must the heart be taught to beat or the lungs to breathe?"

In other words built-in to the heart is *beating* and the very reason for being of the lungs is *breathing*. They need no instruction. They enter into a conspiracy with the circumambient air, a conspiracy of life. It is in this manner that the Soviet citizen breathes the air of humanism, and his heart beats wth the warmth of humanism. Just so his acts and words are measured according to their tenderness and kindness.

This is exemplified by Dr. Beilin in the practice of medicine and its new attitude towards pain in the patient. Speaking of the doctors, sisters and nurses of a Soviet medical staff, he said, "They had swooped down on pain with all the might of their love of man." This "love of man", being the living element in which the soviet worker lives and grows becomes to him an "ultimate concern", the very essential climate of his being. Now the theologians speak of an ultimate concern as a religious concern, and if we use their language we shall have to say that the Soviet people have a religion, for they must have an ultimate concern in the basic humanist philosophy, the comradely outlook of their lives. Let us notice that they are not self-conscious about speaking of "the might of their love for man." No Christian tract could be more unashamed and forthright than this.

In June, 1914, the writer defended a thesis at the University of Nebraska, called "A Modern View of Mysticism." It attempted to involve a human life (rational, creative, moral) with a larger life (the cosmos) in which it exists, and of which it is a part. Claiming Jesus, Francis, Blake, Shaw, as typical activist mystics, true realists, it stripped mysticism of its uniquely passivist character and identified the unitive or mystical life with rational creative harmonious living.

It was in accordance with this thesis that we later came to speak of the Soviet Army as "God's Red Army," to refer to a Communion in a Red Army dug-out before Rzhev; it was in accordance with this thesis (a mere theory) that the Soviet people and the Chinese people (in their actual lives) were said to be filled with the spirit of the Ongoing.

When Krushchev stepped from his plane onto the soil of America he showed to us the fruits of the Soviet humanist philosophy. It was the invasion of an enslaved society by a free soul. Among a people dogged by insecurity, bogged in debt, racked by anxiety and fear and frustration, he walked and talked freely and joyously, summoning them to peace and security and an end to frustration and fear. It was the invasion of a war society by an agent of peace.

Granted that the agent of peace was also an agent of power. Without the power he would not have been invited, and he would not have been listened to. Some think that the fresh element which has been introduced into the international equation in the past decade, the x quantity which is forcing the nations towards disarmament and peace is Soviet Power. It is not the whole truth. Soviet Power without Soviet Humanism would spell at best an armistice of terror. With the advent of Soviet Power plus Soviet Humanism the great colonial and post-colonial powers have been oriented towards peace. The first sign of that orientation was the invasion (using that word advisedly) of America by Premier Krushchev. A newspaperwoman who had been assigned to cover the Krushchev visit reflects the change in the American people's minds. She said, "I always felt hostile toward the Soviet Union. And like many others, I believed what was said and written here. But I happened to accompany Krushchev on his amazing tour. I took a close look at him, listened to his speeches with a critical ear and contested his arguments in my mind. Suddenly I realized that all the notions we had entertained over so many years had to be thrown out as rubbish. I saw that he was a real human being, that he was suggesting things that were serious and even more important, quite feasible. You can take it or leave it, but now this man has my sympathy."

"The practical is the priestly," says George MacLeod of Iona, and continues, "The secular and the sacred are merging... The atomic is not dead matter. It is "Light Energy'. A hundred years ago Marx declared the material nature of all things, writing unrecognized in the British Museum. His thesis has at last seeped to the market place. But that is not the end. Unrecognized in the British Museum, scientists of our own day discover that all 'things' are spiritual. But it has not yet come to the market place . . . Christ is the Light and the Life of the world . . . He is, as the Celts foresaw, 'the sun behind all suns'; the energy behind

the machine: the Fundamental at the center, not the ambulance man at the periphery."

Religion, according to Paul Tillich, ranking theologian of our time, is "ultimate concern." The Russian revolution, he says, "was a conquest from within, not by an irreligious system but by a religion of social justice in secular terms."

When Premier Krushchev came to America he was met by the State Department's calculated coolness and placed under the guardianship of the Soviet hater Lodge. His warm dynamic personality melted the coolness, even overcame Lodge, and walked straight into the hearts of the American people. His dignity, his frankness, his brilliant free play of humour, his insistence on ending the cold war, carried their message to the people and to the world, as did his speech to the United Nations in which he transmitted the Soviet offer of complete disarmament in four years. Was this religion? Was it Christian? In the large sense of the word it was religion, for the speech and actions of Krushchev were of ultimate concern. He was not fooling when he made these suggestions and he would not be put off by pleasantries or the opposite. The brightness of his wit played around a dead seriousness of purpose: no less than the dream of the carpenter of Nazareth, peace among men of good will, no less than the dream of Isaiah, the end of war on the earth.

Some consider the term 'religious' outmoded. In the Soviet Union they have outmoded it by secularizing it. Quite literally the spirit of the Nazarene has moved out into the Soviet world and conquered it. As was quoted in *Northern Neighbors* from Mordecai Johnson, ". . . at the central part of the Communist movement there is a simple and great faith." An American poet, Maurice Ogden, author of *Hangman*, says the Krushchev visit was the turning point in melting the cold war. A midwest American agriculturist, George Vikingstad, agrees as to the historic importance of that visit.

Krushchev, in his great call for total disarmament and peace, was the voice of the humanist portion of the world. A Soviet writer asks: "What could ever be pitted against this great and humane call? What could ever mute it, this clarion call inspired by the love of man?"

Can it be that the man K. is at long last helping man to stand erect and become human?

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS

Dorothy Day, an old friend, whose house of hospitality in New York we visited years ago with Father 'Jimmie' Thompkins of Antigonish, has been sending us her paper "The Catholic Worker." Staunchly Roman Catholic, thoroughly orthodox, steadied with the gyroscope of true mysticism, she manifests (with her free-wheeling colleagues) a dynamic revolutionary Christianity. She is deeply concerned with peace and has gone to prison in defiance of the Civil Defence drills in New York City. In this issue (June, 1960) is an article by Robert Casey revealing the true background of the Kishi riots in Japan:

"During a bitter Diet session Socialist Party member, Kazuo Asukada, grilled the Government's Foreign Minister, Aiichiro Fujiyama, severely and in the cross examination (called "interpellations" in Japanese parliamentary language) established that: there are now three U2 jet planes at the Atsugi Air Base; that these planes do not bear identification markings of any type; that they are painted a certain kind of black to prevent radar detection; that they are making flights without any due report to the Japanese air controlling authorities which is in direct violation of the existing Japan-U. S. Administrative Agreement; that they are with another organization and not with the U. S. Air Force; and in closing his interpellations the Socialist Dietman directly charged that these "black jets" were engaged in espionage activities against China and Russia from Japanese bases.

"Previous to the present mounting feeling against the ratification of the Japan-U. S. Security Treaty there occurred the now famous Fujisawa Incident. This was occasioned by the emergency landing of a U2 at Fujisawa airport in Kanagawa Prefecture. People gathered about the grounded plane but the U2 pilot drove the Japanese spectators away at pistol point. Not however before specimens of the black paint used on the plane had been obtained. These specimens were then examined by Professor Kazuhide Yamada and his scientific colleagues at the Defense University. These specimens were then found to be of a material designed to prevent radar detection.

"Kyodo's reporters questioned five Japanese spectators, who had declined to testify before the Special Diet Committee holding hearings on the Japan-U. S. Security Treaty. These five, plus about 30 other members of a Japanese Glider Club, were present when the American U2 plane made its emergency landing on the Fujisawa air strip. They told the Kyodo reporters that the pilot wore a plain suit without identification markings of any sort That he emerged limping from the plane and in response to an enquiry from them he said he was all right.

"A survey of people residing near or working at Yokota and

Atsugi Air Bases confirm reports that these black jets do not bear identification markings of any sort.

"The Socialist Party officially demanded the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. U2 type planes from Japan, and the holding of a general election now to ascertain the feelings of the Japanese people today on the question of ratification of the Security Treaty; which was pushed through the Diet at a special midnight session after the police had come into the Diet itself and bodily removed the Opposition members. The Socialist Party calls this entire plenary session, and its ratification of the Treaty, invalid. Mass demonstrations have occurred throughout the country against the Kishi Government and its ratification of the Treaty. One day's demonstrations were estimated to have involved two million people. Against this background the Eisenhower visit must be judged. It could well be the spark needed to set off the powder keg."

Speaking of Japan *The Catholic Worker* takes the following from *The Progressive* and calls it "Letter of Love":

On August 6, 1945, Major Claude Eatherly commanded an American plane which dropped the world's first atomic bomb—on Hiroshima—killing more than 100,000 men, women, and children. Major Eatherly is today a patient in an American mental institution—the victim of a corroding sense of guilt and the fear that the Japanese are "after him" seeking revenge.

On August 6, last year, 14 years afterwards, a group of Japanese citizens wrote a letter to Major Eatherly which might do more than psychiatric treatment to restore him to mental health. Said the Japanese in their letter:

"We wish you to know that we regard you as a victim of war in much the same way as those who were injured in the war, and are praying for your complete recovery and that the day shall come when you will join the forces of good will, forgiving any wrong for establishing a peaceful world, a world of reconciliation and love. May God bless you, hasten your recovery; and help you so that you may decide to devote your life to the cause of peace."

The Hungarian Churches: A dear friend of the editor, Bishop Lajos Veto, publisher of "Hungarian Church Press," sends us that paper with its late news from that wonderful country. In his official capacity as Ministerial President of the Central Church Office of the Lutheran Church, he spoke these words to a conference marking the 15th anniversary of the country's liberation:

"The end of World War II meant a liberation only to that Lutheran pastor who, above all, made sincere penitence for everything by which the members and also the pastors of our church, including himself, contributed to the cause of World War II and made themselves indirectly responsible for the destruction which

followed in its wake. We must accept the truth: Whatever a man soweth, that shall he reap.

"Then we must identify ourselves wtih the proletariate of our people and mankind, with the poor (the am ha-arets) to whom the word of God, beginning with the message of the prophets, has always promised liberation."

Not only was the country liberated from medievalism and Hitlerism, he said, "but all was brought about in such a manner as to realize the best political objectives of Hungarian Protestantism. The Church now has inner freedom, unfettered by the political shackles of the past. Only a false Christianity is afraid of the better future of our country." Salutations and warm greetings from the *New Christian to* Dr. Veto!

Stanley Evans leaves the East End parish of Holy Trinity, Dalston, to become a Canonresidentiary and Chancellor of Southwark Cathedral, and Director of Junior Clergy. When Holy Trinity was dedicated as the church of the International Circus Clowns' Club, Fr. Evans, the clowns' chaplain, proclaimed the duty of every Christian to become a fool for Christ's sake. To many this man whom the local Press chose to call the "Red Vicar" is indeed a fool. Almost twenty years were to pass before he was given a living, but this, to one whose convictions go so deep, is no dishonour. Since his student days, Stanley Evans has been fired with a passion for social justice. He labours in the certainty that every Christian is called to be a fellow-worker in establishing Christ's Kingdom of righteousness and peace. His slight figure, his "lean and hungry look," are characteristic. But there is nothing slight about the commanding intellect of the Christian, and therefore—as he affirms—the Socialist Stanley Evans.

The Real Payola:

UE News, official organ of the United Electric, Radio and Machine Workers of America, (11 East 51st. Street, New York 22, N.Y.) is one of the finest labor papers in the USA. Having printed a series of six articles on the real causes of inflation, and having nailed the lie that wages are the cause of profiteering, they now deal with "a colossal and little-known robbery of the U.S. government, the U.S. taxpayer and the consuming public by the biggest corporations, primarily the so-called 'defense' corporations. This particular robbery is effected through a patent monopoly extorted by the corporations on research and development done at the expense of the U.S. Government."

Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, estimates that the private use of these patents has cost the American consumer possibly over 100 billion dollars.

NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY - AUGUST 1960

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I. Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etianne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**